EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS
COUR EUROPÉENNE DES DROITS DE L'HOMME

FIRST SECTION

DECISION

Application no. 459/20
FUNDACJA INSTYTUT REPORTAŻU
against Poland
(see appended table)

The European Court of Human Rights (First Section), sitting on 20 November 2025 as a Committee composed of:

Frédéric Krenc*, President*,
Davor Derenčinović,
Alain Chablais*, judges*,

and Viktoriya Maradudina, *Acting Deputy Section Registrar,*

Having regard to the above application lodged on 13 December 2019,

Having regard to the declaration submitted by the respondent Government requesting the Court to strike the application out of the list of cases,

Having deliberated, decides as follows:

FACTS AND PROCEDURE

The applicant's details are set out in the appended table.

The applicant was represented by Mr M. Ślusarek, a lawyer practising in Warsaw.

The applicant's complaints under Article 10 of the Convention concerning the freedom of expression were communicated to the Polish Government ("the Government").

THE LAW

The Government informed the Court that they proposed to make a unilateral declaration with a view to resolving the issues raised by these complaints. They further requested the Court to strike out the application in accordance with Article 37 of the Convention.

The Government acknowledged a violation of Article 10 of the Convention regarding the interference with the applicant's freedom of expression. They offered to pay the applicant the amount detailed in the

appended table and invited the Court to strike the application out of the list of cases in accordance with Article 37 § 1 (c) of the Convention. The amount would be converted into the currency of the respondent State at the rate applicable on the date of payment, and would be payable within three months from the date of notification of the Court's decision. In the event of failure to pay this amount, the Government undertook to pay simple interest on it, from the expiry of that period until settlement, at a rate equal to the marginal lending rate of the European Central Bank during the default period plus three percentage points.

The payment will constitute the final resolution of the case.

The applicant was sent the terms of the Government's unilateral declaration several weeks before the date of this decision. The Court has not received a response from the applicant accepting the terms of the declaration.

The Court observes that Article 37 § 1 (c) enables it to strike a case out of its list if:

> "... for any other reason established by the Court, it is no longer justified to continue the examination of the application".

Thus, it may strike out applications under Article 37 § 1 (c) on the basis of a unilateral declaration by a respondent Government even if the applicant wishes the examination of the case to be continued (see, in particular, the *Tahsin Acar v. Turkey* judgment (preliminary objections) [GC], no. 26307/95, §§ 75-77, ECHR 2003-VI).

The Court has established clear and extensive case-law concerning complaints relating to the freedom of expression and expressing opinions by way of protest (see, for example, *Baldassi and Others v. France*, nos. 15271/16 and 6 others, §§ 63-64, 11 June 2020, *Perinçek v. Switzerland* [GC], no. 27510/08, § 196 , ECHR 2015 (extracts) and, *mutatis mutandis, Baka v. Hungary* [GC], no. 20261/12, § 159, ECHR 2016).

Noting the admissions contained in the Government's declaration as well as the amount of compensation proposed – which is consistent with the amounts awarded in similar cases – the Court considers that it is no longer justified to continue the examination of the application (Article 37 § 1 (c)).

In the light of the above considerations, the Court is satisfied that respect for human rights as defined in the Convention and the Protocols thereto does not require it to continue the examination of the application (Article 37 § 1 *in fine*).

Finally, the Court emphasises that, should the Government fail to comply with the terms of their unilateral declaration, the application may be restored to the list in accordance with Article 37 § 2 of the Convention (see *Josipović v. Serbia* (dec.), no. 18369/07, 4 March 2008).

In view of the above, it is appropriate to strike the application out of the Court's list of cases.

For these reasons, the Court, unanimously,

Takes note of the terms of the respondent Government's declaration and of the arrangements for ensuring compliance with the undertakings referred to therein;

Decides to strike the application out of its list of cases in accordance with Article 37 § 1 (c) of the Convention.

Done in English and notified in writing on 11 December 2025.

Viktoriya Maradudina Acting Deputy Registrar	Frédéric Krenc President

APPENDIX

Application raising complaints under Article 10 of the Convention
(Freedom of expression)

Application no. Date of introduction	Applicant's name	Representative's name and location	Date of receipt of Government's declaration	Date of receipt of applicant's comments	Amount awarded for pecuniary and non-pecuniary damage per applicant (in euros)[1]	Amount awarded for costs and expenses per application (in euros)[2]
459/20 13/12/2019	**FUNDACJA INSTYTUT REPORTAŻU**	Ślusarek Maciej Warsaw	10/09/2025	08/10/2025	6,750	250

[1] Plus any tax that may be chargeable to the applicant
[2] Plus any tax that may be chargeable to the applicant